

- 6 -

REMARKS

The Examiner has again rejected Claims 1-2, 6, 8, 10-11, 15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abdelnur (USPN 6,789,204) in view of Vogel (USPN 6,816,900), in view of Fanning et al (USPN 6,742,023) and further in view of Shaw (USPN 6,381,741). Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection, especially in view of the amendments made hereinabove.

In particular, the Examiner continues to rely on Figure 4 along with the following excerpt from Fanning to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed "forwarding the task to a local alias URL of the responding peer for performance of the task by the responding server" (see this or similar, but not necessarily identical claim language in each of the independent claims).

"Then, as shown in step 410, the data file is placed in the first distribution data file repository and is automatically made available to other distribution application in the community."
(see col. 12, lines 25-27)

In the Advisory Action mailed November 07, 2005, the Examiner argues that "the claimed URL can be any type of tag forming a representation of a resource. In Fanning, the returned results are the representations of the resource. The user selects the filename when selecting a file to download, URLs are returned as results of a file search which correspond to various back-end servers."

Applicant respectfully disagrees with such assertion. For example, the Examiner's argument that the "claimed URL can be any type of tag forming a representation of a resource" is improper, as it fails to take into consideration the full weight of applicant's claims. Applicant does not claim any type of tag forming a representation of a resource, but rather requires a specific "local alias URL."

With respect to the subject matter of former Claim 3 et al. (now incorporated into each of the independent claims), the Examiner has again rejected the subject matter of

- 7 -

such claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abdelnur (USPN 6,789,204) in view of Vogel (USPN 6,816,900), in view of Fanning et al (USPN 6,742,023) and further in view of Christensen et al. (USPN 2002/0169842). Specifically, the Examiner still relies on the excerpt below from Christensen to meet applicant's claimed technique "wherein said verifying verifies that the local alias URL is approved by the non-local backend server for the requested task."

"[0116] Bi-directional authentication means that when a client integration framework 200 initiates communication through an SSL connection 208 making a connection request 210 through an accept SSL connection request 212 with a server integration framework 202, the server integration framework 202 returns a server certificate 206, sent and signed by the certifying authority 214. The client 200 uses a factory installed public key certificate authenticate server/domain 216 to validate that the server certificate 206 was indeed signed by the certifying authority 214, then the client authenticate server/domain 216 verifies the server URL/IP Address and integration framework 202 Domain name. Once the client 200 has authenticated the server 202, the client certificate sending authority 218 then submits a client certificate 204 to the server integration framework 202. The server integration framework 202 then reverses the process in the authenticate client/domain 220 for the client 200. The HTTP(S) protocol then provides for the private key exchange and facilitates encryption for the remainder of the session."

In the latest Advisory Action mailed November 07, 2005, the Examiner argues that a "client and server mutually authenticates each other so client is verified prior to server servicing the request [0181] to it, as well as server is verified to be assured that they can be trusted before client receives service from it (Fig. 2 and 8)." Whether this allegation is true or not, applicant's claims are still not met. First, for the reasons set forth hereinabove, applicant's claimed "local alias URL" is not met. Further, the mere authentication of a client and server, as noted by the Examiner, simply does not rise to the level of specificity of verifying a URL, again let alone a local alias URL. Only applicant teaches and claims a non-local backend server that specifically verifies that a local alias URL is approved for a requested task (and not just a mere client authentication, etc.).

Still yet, in the latest Advisory Action mailed November 07, 2005, the Examiner now relies on Fig. 2 below from Tsai to meet applicant's claimed technique "wherein the

Nevertheless, despite such deficiencies and in the spirit of expediting the prosecution of the present application, applicant has further distinguished the claimed local alias URL by further incorporating the subject matter of Claim 8 et al., as modified below, into each of the independent claims:

“wherein the request specifies a post method that places data into the local upload directory as a uniquely named file.”

While the Examiner relies on col. 4, lines 32-35 from Abdelnur to meet applicant's previously claimed “post method,” it is noted that Abdelnur is silent with respect to the specifics of applicant's claimed post method that specifically places data into the local upload directory as a uniquely named file.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed.Cir.1991).

Applicant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, since the prior art references, when combined, fail to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, as noted above. Thus, a notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of all of applicant's claim limitations, in combination with the remaining claim elements, is respectfully requested.

- 10 -

Thus, all of the independent claims are deemed allowable. Moreover, the remaining dependent claims are further deemed allowable, in view of their dependence on such independent claims.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 505-5100. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NAI1P278/01.017.01).

Respectfully submitted,
Zilka-Kotab, PC.

Kevin J. Zilka
Registration No. 41,429

P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, CA 95172-1120
408-505-5100